

REMARKS

In applicants earlier amendment the revised claims as above provided were attached to the end of the amendment, Applicant cannot explain how they may have been separated from the body of the Amendment. In any event the amended claims 6 and 7 are now embodied in the amendment listing all of the claims which in this case are represented only by claims 6 and 7.

The rejection of claims 6 and 7 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Howard et al US Patent No. 6, 097,374 in view of the Official Notice taken by the Examiner is respectfully traversed.

Claims 6 and 7 are directed to a method for accessing a computer at a first location to view, create, modify and/or transfer information to and from the computer by an operator at a second location remote from said first location using a video monitor, browser and keyboard processor unit. The title and first paragraph of the specification were also amended to reflect the amended claims .

Claim 6 as now amended should clarify any misunderstanding regarding the subject invention. The operator is located at the second location which is a remotely located from the first location where the computer resides. The operator uses the keyboard processor unit in conjunction with the video monitor at the second location and a wireless communicating device to communicate through the internet via the

browser with the computer at the first location to access information from the computer at the first location. The accessed information is displayed on the video monitor at the second location. The operator then determines from the accessed information whether and to what extent the information stored in the computer at the first location should be modified or to what extent additional information should be added.

This is entirely different from the teaching in Howard et al '37 in which a wrist pendent Keyboard system having a complex optical matrix array of sensors is shown and disclosed for communicating to a Host system at a distant location. Although the Host system is a computer based data processing or communication system which has a video monitor associated with it the wrist pendent keyboard system does not have a video monitor associated with it nor is it intended to possess a video monitor or to be used in conjunction with a video monitor . The wrist pendent is ergonomically designed to permit movement and adjustment of its matrix geometry to alleviate excessive repetition of motion and to optically sense the depression of each key on the keyboard. Moreover, Howard teaches an array of light emitting sources 16 as taught in column 4 lines 10 -62 and as shown Figure 2 in conjunction with an array of detectors which in combination form an optical sensor matrix for optically sensing hand motion and the digit fingers of the operator such as when depressing the keys. This is a totally different system both in concept and methodology from the method of the subject invention in claims 6 and 7. The

wrist pendent is not used or intended to be used at a first location in conjunction with a video monitor for communicating with the Host system at the second location. The fact that the host system has a video monitor is irrelevant to any comparison with the subject invention. Moreover whether the computer in the subject invention of claim 6 has a video monitor associated with it is also irrelevant to the subject invention. The video monitor in claim 6 is being used by the operator at the same location of the operator in conjunction with the keyboard processing unit both of which are remotely located a substantial distant from the computer.

The Examiners reference on page 3 of the Official Communication that software browser may be included in Howard to permit selective display of data on the video monitor 14 is inconsistent with the subject invention since it is the operator who is remotely located a substantial distance from the computer which contains the information to be accessed and displayed on a video monitor located where the operator is located and not where the computer is located as taught in Howard.


Applicant has been trying to make this fundamental distinction between the methodology of the subject invention and Howard '374 clear. The teaching in Howard has little in common with the subject invention. If this distinction is not now clearly brought out in claim 6 as amended a telephone interview with the Examiner is desired and suggested.

Clearly claims 6 and 7 as amended are patentable over Howard '374.

D-SHO-2000-4

Reconsideration and allowance of claims 6 and 7 is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Eugene Lieberstein
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 24645

CERTIFICATION OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to the Commissioner for Patents P. O. Box 1450 Alexandria VA 22313-1450 on March 9, 2005.

Eugene Lieberstein

Name of Party depositing mail Eugene Lieberstein

Signature _____

March 9, 2005

